STAFFING ALLOCATION IN THE WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Report of the Staffing Allocation Workgroup

To the Waste Management Team

October 11, 2000

Table of Contents

I. Objective of the Workgroup:

The FTE Workgroup was formed at the July 12 –13, 2000 meeting of the Waste Management Team (WaMT) as a result of discussion on the agenda item on vacancies and workload analysis. The workgroup was formed from among members of the WaMT and consisted of Colleen Hellenbrand (chair), Kevin Kessler, Don Grasser and Gene Mitchell. The objective of the workgroup was to agree upon and recommend to the WaMT a "target" (baseline) number of FTE for each Region and the Bureau. This target FTE number would allow that if there is a vacancy, and the organizational unit is within the "target" (baseline) number of employees, the supervisor can proceed to fill without holding or ranking vacancies. If the organizational unit has more employees than the "target" number, filling of a vacancy within that organizational unit would occur only upon special appeal to the WaMT. If there is no appeal or if the appeals process is not approved, the vacancy goes to the Waste Management Team for a decision on where it should be allocated based upon program priorities. The workgroup was to spend no more than 40 hrs. per person. An status report was to be provided at the Aug. 2000 WaMT monthly conference call and the final report presented at the Sept. 2000 WaMT conference call. This paper is that final report.

II. Background Information Considered by the Workgroup:

A. Data from the AW Division Reorganization Report:

Below is some data from the November 20, 1995 AW Division Final Reorganization Report One of the toughest tasks of the FTE Workgroup was to establish the relative workload between the bureau and the regions. If we know that, then we can look at how the field work is distributed across the state and how the bureau work is distributed within the central office. In looking at field work, for example, we could look at things like numbers of licensed facilities, numbers of responsible units, geographic area, population, driving distances, etc. Although it wasn't done with a high level of sophistication, the AW Division Reorganization Task Team did look at these issues at the time of reorganization in deciding how to allocate positions among the regions. As a starting point, the 1995 Air and Waste Reorganization Report allocated positions between the bureau and each of the regions. From Appendix J of that report, comes the following information:

129.25 FTE Total WM positions prior to reorganization.
- 67.25 FTE Bureau positions (52% of total FTE)
- 62.0 FTE District positions (48% of total FTE)

115.75 FTE Total WM positions in the REORG organization charts after decentralization, budget cuts and transfers to other programs
- 36.25 FTE Bureau positions (31.3% of total FTE)
- 79.5 FTE Regional positions (68.7% of total FTE)
  - 12.5 FTE NOR positions (10.8% of program total and 15.7% of regional total FTE)
  - 15.0 FTE SCR positions (13.0% of program total and 18.9% of regional total FTE)
  - 22.0 FTE SER positions (19.0% of program total and 27.7% of regional total FTE)
  - 15.0 FTE NER positions (13.0% of program total and 18.9% of regional total FTE)
  - 15.0 FTE WCR positions (13.0% of program total and 18.9% of regional total FTE)

The above data relates to PERM positions only, not to PROJECT or LTEs.

It should be noted that the position allocations shown above from the Air and Waste Reorganization Report may vary slightly from the positions that were actually implemented during reorganization due to subsequent management decisions. Our workgroup used the AW Reorganization report numbers because it was the well documented and because decision subsequent to that report could not be reconstructed by the workgroup.

Among the comments received on the workgroup's September report was a question on why there was no detailed workload analysis at Step 2 for determining the bureau / regional split. A detailed analysis was done as part of reorganization and the workgroup had no new workload data available to it . Therefore, the Air and Waste Reorganization report was used as the starting point and any more detailed attempt at workload analysis between the bureau and the regions was considered beyond the scope of the workgroup's charge with respect to the level of effort and timing of this task.

B. Changes to FTE numbers since Re-org:

The following represents staffing changes that have occurred since the AW Division Reorg. report:

Deduct: 3.75 FTE Recycling Positions
Add: 3.00 FTE (Perm) Non-metallic mining positions
(These non-metallic mining positions were absorbed into the regions and the central office. No new positions were hired.)
Add: 1.00 FTE (Proj) Metallic mining position
Add: 2.00 FTE (Perm) Metallic mining positions
Markart
Kunelius
(These metallic mining positions were absorbed into the NOR and the central office. No new positions were hired.
Deduct: 5.0 FTE (Perm) Federally funded hazardous waste position numbers were lost.
In addition, there are other hazardous waste positions that remain unfilled due to funding constraints.

Positions absorbed by CO after Re-org:
1.00 FTE Metallic Mining Outreach
3.00 FTE Displaced Staff from New Staff Assignments Process who were permanently placed back in Waste Management

C. Current Staffing:

Based on funding constraints, we are able to fill 101.5 permanent positions in the program. Following are the current numbers of permanent positions in the program which are filled or workplanned for:

98.5 FTE Total WM positions currently filled or workplanned for in the program. (This does not include the 3.0 FTE authorized for filling at the 7/00 WaMT meeting nor does it include the mining project position. With those added, the current number is 101.5 permanent and 102.5 permanent plus project)
31.5 FTE Bureau current permanent positions filled or workplanned (does not include the mining project position or the 3.0 FTE permanent authorized for filling at the 7/00 WaMT meeting.)

67.0 FTE Regional current permanent positions filled:

11.0 FTE	NOR positions filled or workplanned
12.0 FTE	SCR positions filled or workplanned
17.0 FTE	SER positions filled or workplanned
13.0 FTE	NER positions filled or workplanned
14.0 FTE	WCR positions filled or workplanned

D. Additional information related to FTE changes:

3.75 FTE Recycling Positions: No explicit decisions were made by the managers regarding the deleted position numbers as to how they related to workload reductions in the program.
Some on the workgroup believe that the stated legislative intent for the recycling position cuts was that the reduction should be targeted at Central Office positions. Others on the WaMT do not share that perspective.

HW Funding: The number of filled positions on the HW grant were reduced because of increased costs to fund the positions. No explicit decisions were made by the managers regarding where those positions should come from based on a workload analysis. Five federally funded position numbers were lost.

Team Leaders: We have created permanent positions and duties for team leader and sub-team leader positions that were not included in the original re-org model, such as Environmental Monitoring, Special Waste and Beneficial Re-use.

Non-Metallic Mining: The initial proposal for non-metallic mining work in the program included 1.00 FTE in Central Office , 0.50 FTE in Legal, and 2.50 FTE in the Region. We are now talking about 1.00 – 1.50 FTE in Central Office and 1.50 – 2.00 FTE in the Regions.

Metallic Mining: There is 1 FTE (4-year) project position in Central Office. (Presently vacant but authorized to be filled.)
There are 2 FTE permanent positions. We have shifted current staff onto the new position numbers to free up other positions to be used for mandatory budget cuts. This did not affect the current distribution of workload or positions.

Team Work Note: Some members of the WaMT have the perspective that more time is being spent on teams than was probably anticipated or planned for in re-org. Therefore, for those that subscribe to that perspective, more resources are being devoted to teams and team management which detracts from time spent on specific activities such as inspections, plan review, rule writing, etc. The work group agrees that some have this perspective, but did not reach consensus on the perspective itself. The converse perspective is that there is an expectation and directive from the Division that decisions be made on a team basis, and there would be an additional workload associated with this.

Data on numbers of facilites and entities. The workgroup considered available data on the numbers of facilities, area, population and entities that might impact workload among the regions. Further discussion in contained in Section VI of this report.

Rotating Sector Specialists: The Waste Management Program has an obligation (resulting from reorganization) to provide a full time FTE or two ½ time FTEs to the Bureau of Cooperative Environmental Assistance (CEA) on a one year rotating basis. The bureau's Recycling Team Leader and

the bureau's mercury specialist have provided the required support to CEA. With the retirement of the team leader and the transfer of the mercury specialist to another position, it is unclear how the program will meet this obligation. The workgroup considered this issue to be beyond it's charge, but it remains an issue with respect to allocation of FTE. See Section IV of this report regarding implementation issues. The issue of staff resources for the program's obligation for a rotating sector specialist will have to be addressed before final "target numbers" for FTE can be established.

III. Overview of the Process Used by the Workgroup and Recommendations:

The work group used the following process to develop alternatives. These steps will be subsequently referred to according to this numbering system.

A. Outline of Process:

Step 1. Determine the total number of positions to use as the baseline

Step 2. Determine the appropriate Central Office vs. Regional split

Options for Step 2:

2.a. Use an "across the board" % reduction based on number of FTE in program at re-org and number of FTE in program now.

2.b. Use calculations that take into account changes to FTE in program since re-organization. Alternatives and sub-alternatives are considered under this option.

2.c. Use a 70%/30% split, which is a rough average of the first two options.

Step 3. Look at individual regions to determine if any adjustments are needed to number of FTE assigned between the regions.

Overall options:

3.a. Develop models which use the data summarized in the data charts. 3 different models – one uses population, area and number of counties, another one doesn't. A third weighs population more heavily.

3.b. Use an "across the board" % reduction based on number of FTE in program at re-org and number of FTE in program now.

B. Recommendations:

1) **Recommendations Related to Target Numbers**. See Sections IV - VI of this report for details and rationale for these recommendations.

Step 1: It is recommended that the baseline number of permanent FTE available should be 101.5 permanent FTE.

Step 2: It is recommended** for step 2 that the 101.5 FTE be split as 70.45 permanent FTE for the regions and 31.05 permanent FTE for the bureau. This recommendation follows alternative II.c. under option 2.b. for step 2)

Step 3: It is recommended** that the regional "target" FTE be as follows in accordance with Model #6 which is the average of Model #1 and Model #4. In addition, it is recommended that the final target numbers be rounded to the nearest 0.5 FTE as shown:

	Calculated Target	Final Rounded Target	Current
SER	18.5 FTE	18.5 FTE	17.0 FTE
SCR	13.2 FTE	13.0 FTE	12.0 FTE
NER	12.8 FTE	13.0 FTE	13.0 FTE
WCR	14.4 FTE	14.5 FTE	14.0 FTE
NOR	11.5 FTE	11.5 FTE	11.0 FTE
Total	70.45 FTE	70.5 FTE	67.0 FTE

** NOTE: After the above recommendations for Steps 2 and 3 were made, a comment was received from the NOR regarding the consideration of NOR mining positions. The workgroup believes that both the NOR comment and the workgroup's calculations and recommendations above could be considered valid and either could be accepted. In either case, it only changes the allocation by 0.3 FTE in the bureau to be split among all of the regions. No region would be affected by more than 0.1 FTE in the calculations. Although the main body of this report was not changed to reflect the NOR comment, the workgroup went through extensive recalculations of the models to be able to determine the outcome if the NOR comment were incorporated. The results from incorporating the NOR comment on mining positions are presented in Appendix 5. Appendix 5 does not recalculate all of the options and alternatives for Step 3 of the process. Appendix 5 does, however, contain the information to compare the above recommendations with the recommendations that would result if the NOR comment were incorporated.

2. **Recommendations Related to Implemention and Appeals.** Section IV of this report describes five implementation issues and an appeals process. The workgroup recommends that the WaMT act on each of the implementation issues and that the WaMT adopt the appeals process that the workgroup recommends.

IV. Implementation and Appeals Process

A. Implementation Issues: There are several issues regarding present vacancies, timing for implementation of the process and other program obligations. The workgroup discussed these implementation issues and makes the following recommendations:

1) **Timing:** The process should become applicable immediately upon agreement of the Waste Management Team. Agreement requires adoption of target numbers as well as reaching decisions on the other issues described in this section. Once this new process is applicable, new vacancies within a work unit can be refilled without going back to the WMT as long as the work unit is within its target number. This will allow most vacancies to be filled in a much more timely manner. The vacancies discussed in 3) below wouldn't be included in the new process.

2) **July, 2000 WaMT Decisions**: A decision was made at the July WMT meeting to allow CO to fill three positions. The small group recommends that the top two positions (Recycling Team Leader and Hellenbrand/Gold combined position) continue through the filling process that has already started. The third position (Hellenbrand/Johnson) that was authorized for filling, as well as the fourth position (Ivanov) identified as next in line should be reevaluated under the new process.

3) **New Vacancies:** Two new vacancies have occurred between the July meeting and today (Mark Stephanson – WCR and Mary Rothenmaier – SCR). The small group

recommends that a decision be made at the October, 2000 WaMT meeting on how those positions (as well as any additional vacancies that may occur before the effective date of the new process) should be dealt with. Alternatives include:

a) consideration of these two new vacancies in a pool with all vacancies within the program. The WaMT would then make a decision similar to that made at the July, 2000 WaMT meeting to select the two highest priority vacancies within the overall statewide program and authorizing those positions to be filled.

b) authorizing the two regions with the new vacancies to proceed to fill immediately since both regions are below their proposed FTE "target number."

A decision on these new vacancies needs to be made before the new process using target numbers can be implemented.

4) **Work Units Over Target Numbers:** The intent of the target numbers is to deal with new vacancies as they occur. This process does not deal with filled positions. Positions in work units that are over their target level will not be transferred until a new vacancy occurs in that unit (see interim appeals process for an exception to the transfer of a vacancy from an over target work unit). There will also be no formal transfer of work responsibilities (i.e. an existing staff in an over target work unit remaining in the same location but doing work for a unit that is under target) between work units if there is no vacancy to transfer. Informal arrangements between work unit supervisors may still be pursued as is currently done in the plan review area.

5) **Rotating Sector Specialist Obligation:** As indicated in Section II.D. of this report, the Waste Management Program has an obligation resulting from reorganization to provide a full time FTE or two ½ time FTEs to the Bureau of Cooperative Environmental Assistance (CEA). This obligation was originally intended to be addressed by one-year rotating assignments, but more recently, a permanent transfer of a position of CEA was proposed for the biennial budget. While this position is no longer part of the proposed budget (it was to be reallocated from WA to CEA), we do need to make good on the commitment. The bureau director proposes that the bureau assume 1/2 FTE sector specialist, and that one of the regions reassign a staff person to make another 1/2 FTE sector specialist. This will need to be a permanent assignment under the bureau director's proposal and could affect the "target numbers" that are finally agreed to. The Waste Management Program can negotiate a sector that will help us meet the long-term strategic goals that we have agreed to for the program. We should also look at working in our priorities process in the selection. This needs to be resolved before the new process based upon target numbers can be implemented.

B. Appeals: As indicated in Section I, if there is a vacancy, and the organizational unit is within the "target" (baseline) number of employees, the supervisor can proceed to fill without holding or ranking the vacancy. If the organizational unit has more employees than the "target" number, filling of a vacancy within that organizational unit would occur only upon special appeal to the WaMT. If there is no approved appeal, the vacancy goes to the Waste Management Team for a decision on where it should be allocated based upon program priorities.

An appeal may be made for either of two types of FTE adjustments to the "target numbers" – either an "interim" adjustment or a "permanent" adjustment. The descriptions and procedures for these adjustments are as follows:

1) A**ppeal for Interim FTE Adjustment**. An organizational unit's appeal seeks authorization to fill a position and exceed it's FTE "target number" on an interim basis. The target number for that organizational unit is not changed. This involves "borrowing" a position because of an overall high priority need of the program related to a particular vacancy. The organizational unit that is the "borrowing" unit would have to advance the appeal. The "lending" organizational unit would have to be identified as part of the appeal decision. If the appeal is approved, a record would be kept of the borrowed position. When the borrowing organizational unit has another vacancy of a permanent position, the borrowed position would be repaid to the lending unit.

2) **Appeal for Permanent FTE Adjustment**. An organizational unit's appeal seeks a permanent change to the FTE "target number" based on overall program priorities. This involves a permanent "shift" in the target FTE and moving an FTE target from one organizational unit to another. The organizational unit that promotes the appeal would identify where the target number would be shifted from and where it would be shifted to. If the appeal were approved, the Waste Management Team would change the "target" FTE numbers for both the donating and the receiving organizational unit.

Appeal Procedure:

- The Waste Management Team member making the appeal will have to cite why the proposed FTE adjustment (identified as either interim or permanent) is consistent with and necessary under both the Waste Management Strategic Program Direction and the Waste Management Priority Setting Process. The appeal will also have to cite why the current mix of classifications and staff within that organizational unit is unable to accomplish the priority goals of the statewide program.
- If an appeal is advanced, the decision will be made by a formal vote. No exceptions are allowed.
- There are ten votes allowed as follows: Each of the 5 Regional Team Leaders gets one vote, each of the 4 Section Chiefs gets one vote, and the Bureau Director gets one vote.
- All voting will be by secret ballot only .
- A two thirds majority of the ten votes (i.e. 7 affirmative votes) is required for an appeal to be approved,
- If a region or the bureau cannot accept the appeal decision of the Waste Management Team, any member of the Air and Waste Team may appeal the decision to the Air and Waste Management Team in accordance with the rules and procedures of that team.

The alternative to the procedure recommended above would be for the consensus process normally used by the WaMT to make decisions to apply. The consensus process requires only that everyone can live with the majority opinion. The workgroup recommends the procedure above for the appeal procedure rather than the consensus process.

V. Step 1 – Details

Determine the total number of positions to use as the baseline.
The workgroup determined that the baseline number of permanent FTE available should be 101.5 permanent FTE. This represents the number of permanent FTE which are presently filled or being recruited (98.5) plus those additional vacant positions (3.0 FTE) that we are able to fund and which the WaMT authorized for filling at it's July, 2000 meeting at Merrimac. In addition to the 101.5 permanent FTE, there is also a mining project position that the bureau is presently in the process of filling for a total of 102.5 permanent and project positions in the program. Neither the mining project position nor any LTE positions were considered as part of the baseline because of their short-term duration.

VI. Step 2 – Details

Determine the appropriate Central Office vs. Regional split considering the following options listed as 2.a., 2.b. and 2.c.
Note that these are mutually exclusive options for Step 2, they are not consecutive sub-steps. The results of each of these options for step 2 is compared in Appendix 1, Table A to the present situation where there are currently 67.0 permanent FTE filled or workplanned in the regions and 31.5 permanent FTE filled or workplanned in the bureau. These numbers do not include the mining project position or the 3.0 FTE permanent authorized for filling at the 7/00 WaMT meeting.

<u>Option 2.a.</u> Use an "across the board" % reduction based on number of FTE in program at re-org and number of FTE in program now.

We currently have 110 FTE authorized position numbers in the program (107.0 FTE "old" (including the 1.0 FTE mining project) plus the 3.0 FTE "new" Nonmetallic Mining). Of the "authorized" position numbers, we've currently been able to fill only 101.5 perm. plus 1.0 project FTE because of funding constraints. We've concluded that we cannot add any new staff for NMM to this total unless we eliminate other currently funded positions. One might say, therefore, that we're currently able to fund only **78.5 %** (101.5 / 129.25) of the permanent positions we had <u>prior to</u> reorganization and only **87.7%** (101.5.5 / 115.75) of the permanent positions that we had <u>following</u> reorganization. That's a **12.3%** reduction in permanent positions since reorganization.

The 115.75 post-reorg. permanent positions were distributed as follows:

115.75 FTE Total WM positions in the REORG organization charts after decentralization, budget cuts and transfers to other programs
- 36.25 FTE Bureau positions (31.3% of total FTE)
- 79.5 FTE Regional positions (68.7% of total FTE)
  - 12.5 FTE NOR positions (10.8% of program total and 15.7% of regional total FTE)
  - 15.0 FTE SCR positions (13.0% of program total and 18.9% of regional total FTE)
  - 22.0 FTE SER positions (19.0% of program total and 27.7% of regional total FTE)
  - 15.0 FTE NER positions (13.0% of program total and 18.9% of regional total FTE)
  - 15.0 FTE WCR positions (13.0% of program total and 18.9% of regional total FTE)

If the 12.3% reduction had been distributed evenly across the bureau and regions and we applied the **.877** factor to each of the above totals, we'd get the following:

101.5 FTE Total WM permanent positions currently filled, workplanned for or approved by WaMT for filling split as follows.

- 31.79 FTE Bureau permanent positions (31.3% of total perm. FTE)
- 69.71 FTE Regional permanent positions (68.7% of total perm. FTE)
  - 10.96 FTE NOR positions (10.8% of program total and 15.7% of regional total FTE)
  - 13.15 FTE SCR positions (13.0% of program total and 18.9% of regional total FTE)
  - 19.29 FTE SER positions (19.0% of program total and 27.7% of regional total FTE)
  - 13.15 FTE NER positions (13.0% of program total and 18.9% of regional total FTE)
  - 13.15 FTE WCR positions (13.0% of program total and 18.9% of regional total FTE)

<u>Option 2.b.</u> Use calculations which take into account changes to FTE in program since re-organization.

In proceeding with Option 2.b., the workgroup decided that the metallic mining positions, both in the regions and in the bureau should be considered separately since the metallic mining workload is clearly distributed quite differently than other workload within the program. This applies both to Alternatives I and II of step 2.b.. The work group also decided to consider dealing with the 3.75 FTE Recycling cut differently than other across-the-board cuts that have occurred since Reorganization. This is considered in Alternative II, but not in Alternative I.

Alternative I for Option 2.b.:

Subtract out metallic mining positions at reorg, calculate bureau/region split, then add present mining positions back in to determine target. Don't attempt to deal with RCY FTE cuts differently that all other cuts since reorg:

1) Determine present staffing without metallic mining:
   Start with 101.5 FTE perm. (98.5 + 3.0) which we can afford to fill
   Subtract 5.0 FTE perm. presently in metallic mining (4 in bureau and 1 in NOR)
   = **96.5** FTE in program without mining staff (101.5 – 5)

2) Determine bureau/region split at reorg without mining:
   115.75 FTE on org. charts at Reorg. (of which 36.25 were bureau and 79.5 were region)
   Subtract 6 FTE on charts for metallic mining at that time (4 in bureau and 2 in NOR)
   = **109.75** FTE in the program at Reorg. w/o mining (115.75 – 6.0) (36.25 – 4 = 32.25 were bureau and 79.5 – 2 = 77.5 were region)
   29.4% were in the bureau at Reorg - - 32.25 / 109.75 (w/o mining)
   70.6% were in the regions at Reorg. - - 77.5 / 109.75 (w/o mining)

3) Apply Reorg ratios to present FTE :
   96.5 FTE x 29.4% = **28.37** FTE in bureau (w/o mining)
   96.5 FTE x 70.6% = **68.13** FTE in regions (w/o mining)

4) Determine "target" number of FTE in each region and bureau:

4.a.) The regional total target is **69.13** FTE (68.13 from #3 above plus 1.0 mining in NOR) as follows:

Proceed to step 3 in Section VII of this report. Apply an agreed upon model (see alternative models for regional workload) to the 68.13 FTE in the regions (from step 3) to determine the split between regions. Then when the split between regions is done, determine the total regional target by adding the 1.0 FTE back in NOR for metallic mining for a total of 69.13 FTE in the regions (68.13 from #3 above plus 1.0 = 69.13).

4.b. The bureau "target" is **32.37** FTE (permanent w/o mining project position)
(28.37 FTE from #3 above plus the 4.0 FTE perm. for metallic mining which were subtracted in step 1)

Alternative II for Option 2.b.

In addition to subtracting the mining positions in alternative I, specifically account for and perhaps calculate differently, the RCY 3.75 FTE cut since Reorganization.. Add the lost recycling positions back in to the 96.5 FTE from step 1 of Alternative I above so that the starting point is 100.25 FTE (96.5 + 3.75). Then determine how to subtract the recycling 3.75 FTE back out according to a calculated bureau/region split. Three ways of doing this which were considered (called alternatives II.a, II.b, and II.c.):

Alternative II.a for Option 2b: Consider the RCY cuts with the same bureau/region split as other FTE cuts since reorg.. This assumes that the workload for the RCY cuts is divided proportionately with the division of other workload in the program.

If 29.4% of the recycling cut was bureau and 70.6% was region (% from step 2 in Alternative I above), then the same answer as Alternative I, step 3 results:
29.4% of 3.75 = 1.10 FTE recycling cut in bureau
70.6% of 3.75 = 2.65 FTE recycling cut in regions
100.25 FTE x .294 = **29.47** FTE bureau w/o mining and w/o 3.75 FTE recycling cut.
100.25 FTE x .706 = **70.78** FTE regions w/o mining and before the 3.75 FTE recycling cut.
29.47 – 1.10 = **28.37** FTE bureau w/o mining and w/ recycling cut
70.78 – 2.65 = **68.13** FTE regions w/o mining and w/ recycling cut
Note: 28.37 + 68.13 = 96.5 FTE w/o mining and w/ recycling cut
The **bureau "target** is (28.37 from above + 4 mining) = **32.37** FTE permanent
The **region target** is (68.13 from above + 1.0 mining) = **69.13** FTE permanent

Alternative II.b.for Option 2b: Consider 100% of the RCY FTE cuts to have been taken from the bureau. This results in the following:

25.72 FTE in the bureau
[29.47 FTE (from calculation in II.a. above) – 3.75 = 25.72]
w/o mining and w/ recycling cuts.
70.78 FTE in the regions (from calculation in II.a. above)
w/o mining and w/ recycling cuts.
Note: 25.72 + 70.78 = 96.5 FTE w/o mining and w/ recycling cut
The **bureau "target** is (25.72 from above + 4 mining) = **29.72** FTE permanent
The **region target** is (70.78 from above + 1.0 mining) = **71.78** FTE permanent

Alternative II.c.for Option 2b: Split the difference between Alternatives II.a. and II.b.: This assumes that the workload for the RCY cuts is divided proportionately with the division of other workload in the program.

27.05 FTE in the bureau w/o mining and w/ recycling cuts [this is calculated as (28.37 + 25.72) / 2 = 27.05
69.45 FTE in the regions w/o mining and w/ recycling cuts [this is calculated as (68.13 + 70.78) / 2 = 69.45
The **bureau "target** is (27.05 from above + 4 mining) = **31.05** FTE permanent
The **region target** is (69.45 from above + 1.0 mining) = **70.45** FTE permanent
Note: 27.05 + 69.45 = 96.5 FTE w/o mining and w/ recycling cut.
Note: Under Alternative II.c., of the 3.75 FTE RCY cut, the bureau loses 2.42 FTE and the regions lose 1.33 FTE RCY positions

Option 2.c. Use a 70%/30% split, which is a rough average of the first two options for Step 2. This option would apply the most simple calculation for determining the region/bureau split of permanent FTE. Although this is the most simple split, it is also the most arbitrary based upon rounding and approximation of the results from other models. Because there are so many variables that can legitimately be argued, the 70/30 split is an arbitrary way to avoid long and acrimonious debate. If the WaMT could not come to an agreement on the other models, then the 70/30 split would give an overall approximation of the workload split between the regions and the bureau. Under this option, the target results would be as follows:

101.5 FTE Total (permanent positions which can be funded in the program.)
30.45 FTE in the bureau (.30 x 101.5 = 30.45 FTE)
71.05 FTE in the regions (.70 x 101.5 = 71.05 FTE)

Step 2 Conclusion: For Step 2, the Work Group recommends option 2.b. Although more complicated, this option takes into account the fact that the distribution of the mining workload is different than other workload. Further, the Work Group recommends the use of Alternative II rather than Alternative I under option 2.b. to account for the loss of the recycling positions. Finally, the Work Group recommends the selection of Alternative II.c. for step 2.b. for distributing the loss of recycling positions. The results of all the options in step 2 are summarized in the table entitled "Regions/Bureau Split – Target Options" in Section VII of this report.

To arrive at the overall "target" number of 101.5 FTE (perm.), 5.0 FTE (4 bureau and 1.0 NOR) have to be added back in after the calculations with the "models" are done in step 3. To arrive at the 102.5 perm. plus project FTE in the program, the 1.0 FTE project FTE must, in addition, be added to the bureau.

Proceeding with the recommendation of the Work Group, **69.45** perm. FTE for the regions plus **1.0** perm FTE for NOR mining = a total of **70.45** perm. FTE in the regions would be carried to Step 3 of the process.

VII. Step 3 – Details

Look at individual regions to determine if any adjustments are needed to number of FTE assigned between the regions.

The workgroup developed 5 models for apportioning the permanent FTE in the regions. Under Models #1 - #4 regional mining positions were considered separately. For those models, 69.45 FTE were apportioned among the regions and then the 1.0 FTE NOR mining position was added afterward for the regional total of 70.45 FTE. As a basis for comparison to the first four models that consider metallic mining positions separately, Model #5 does not consider the NOR mining position separately.

Two overall options were considered:

Under **Option 3.a.,** a formula was used based upon data on things like population, land area and numbers of facilities. There were three alternative models developed called Models #1,2, and 3.

Option 3.b. uses an "across the board" % reduction approach based upon the percent of overall reduction of FTE in the program since reorganization and then applying that percentage to the numbers of positions at the time of reorganization.

The results of these options are summarized in the data tables that are part of Section VII of this report. Details follow:

Option 3.a. The workgroup first assembled and considered available data on the numbers of facilities, area, population and entities that might impact workload among the regions. Attributes that were considered were population of the region, land area, number of counties, responsible units for recycling, material recovery facilities, industrial landfills, municipal landfills, demolition landfills, hazardous waste large quantity generators, hazardous waste treatment storage and disposal facilities, solid waste non-landfill licensed facilities, and nonmetallic mines. The statewide and regional numbers for these attributes are summarized in the table entitled "Attribute Data Chart". The percentage of the overall statewide total in each region for each attribute was calculated and is summarized in the table entitled "Percentage of Totals for Attributes".

The formula used in each model for each attribute was the "% of total" times the "weighting factor". Weighting factors totaling to 1.00 were developed under each of the three models for the attributes. Model #1 considers all factors. Model #2 does not consider population, land area or number of counties. Model #3 gives greater weight to population than to land area. Those attributes that were specific to solid waste, hazardous waste recycling and nonmetallic mining were grouped and a relative weight based upon current workplanning guidance was given to each of the main program areas. That overall relative weight was then apportioned among the attributes that were specific to that program area. The weighting factors are summarized in the table entitled "Weighting Factors Used in Calculations". The products of (% of total) X (weighting factor) for each attribute added together for a total percentage of available staff for each region. These percentages are summarized in the table entitled "Regional Allocation Models". Multiplying these percentages times the number of available positions gives the number of FTE for that model (except the NOR mining position which is added back in). This information is summarized in the table entitled "Step 3 – Regional FTE".

The Waste Management Team was given an opportunity to comment on Models #1 and #2. One comment was received suggesting that more weight be given to population and less weight be given to land area. Model #3 was added and considered in response to that comment. Note again

that Models #1 -#3 all subtract the 1.0 FTE for metallic mining and then add it back in for the NOR after the calculations are made..

Option 3.b. This option uses an "across the board" % reduction based on number of FTE in program at the time of reorganization and number of FTE in program now. Each region's proportion of the total regional positions at the time of reorganization is calculated and that relative proportion remains the same but is applied to the reduced number of positions presently available. This "across the board" % reduction approach is the same approach as was considered in Option 2.a. in Step 2 for determining the region / bureau split. Under this option, two models were developed. These are referred to as Model #4 and Model #5 in the attached charts. As with Models #1 - #3, Model #4 subtracts out the NOR metallic mining position prior to the calculations and then adds it back in after reorganization. Model #5 does not subtract out and then add back in the metallic mining position in NOR.

Following are the calculations for Model #4.

> At Reorg, there were 36.25 FTE in the bureau and 79.5 FTE in the regions. Of the 78.5 regional total (79.5 less 1.0 for mining), the following was the proportional split:
>
> NOR 14.7 % (12.5 – 1.0 for mining = 11.5 / 78.5 = 14.7 %)
> SCR 19.1% (15 / 78.5)
> SER 28.0% (22 / 78.5)
> NER 19.1% (15 / 78.5)
> WCR 19.1% (15 / 78.5)
>
> With 69.45 FTE in the regions w/o the 1.0 mining position (70.45 with mining) and after the Recycling cut (from the recommended alternative II.c. above), the "target" regional staffing would be divided with Model 4 as follows:
>
> NOR 11.2 FTE ((69.45 x .147) + 1 mining = 10.2 FTE + 1.0 = 11.2)
> SCR 13.3 FTE (69.45 x .191 = 13.3)
> SER 19.4 FTE (69.45 x .280 = 19.4)
> NER 13.3 FTE (69.45 x .191 = 13.3)
> WCR 13.3 FTE (69.45 x .191 = 13.3)

Model #5 uses the same calculations with the following changes related to the NOR metallic mining position:

- At the time of reorganization, there are 79.5 rather than 78.5 total regional positions.
- At the time of reorganization, NOR is considered to have 12.5 rather than 11.5 FTE

The results of Models #4 and #5 (expressed in percentage of regional FTE) are summarized in the table entitled "Regional Allocation Models". Multiplying these percentages times the number of available positions gives the number of FTE for that model (except the NOR mining position which is added back in). This information is summarized in the table entitled "Step 3 – Regional FTE – Target Options".

Conclusion of Step 3:
The workgroup recommends the selection of a compromise between Model #1 and Model #4 for allocating target positions among the regions. We have designated that compromise as Model #6. We do not believe that Model #2 (which ignores population, land area and number of counties)

should be used. Despite the one comment that population should be given more weight, we believe that Model #1 is more reasonable than Model #3. Models #4 and #5 continue the proportional split from reorganization. Of those two, we support Model #4 because it subtracts out mining separately as we recommend for both Step 2 and for Step 3.

If the Waste Management Team wished to select "target" FTE numbers that are based entirely on the attributes, Model #1 would be our recommendation. If the "targets" were to be based on the proportional distribution of staff between regions, Model #4 would be our recommendation. We believe that averaging the results of those two models represents a reasonable compromise and that (Model #6) is our recommendation.

VIII. Appendices

Appendix 1: Table A - Step 2 – Region/Bureau Split – Target FTE Option

Appendix 2: Table B - Step 3, Option 3.a. – Attribute Data Chart

Appendix 3: Table C - Step 3, Option 3.a. - Percentage of Totals for Attributes
Table D - Step 3, Option 3.a. – Weighting Factors Used in Calculations

Appendix 4: Table E - Step 3, Regional Allocation Models
Table F - Step 3, Regional FTE Target Options

Appendix 5: Alternative Analysis for NOR Mining FTE Comment

Appendix 1

Table A - Step 2 – Regions / Bureau Split -
Target Options - Permanent FTE

Option #	Current FTE	2.a. Across the Board %	2.b.I. Mining Separated	2.b.II.a. RCY Cuts Apportioned	2.b.II.b. RCY Cuts 100% Bureau	2.b.II.c. RCY Cuts Split the Difference	2.c. 70% / 30% Split
Regions total	67.0	69.71	69.13	69.13	71.78	70.45	71.05
Bureau	34.5 (31.5 + 3.0 FTE authorized by WaMT 7/00	31.79	32.37	32.37	29.72	31.05	30.45
Total Perm. FTE	101.5	101.5	101.5	101.5	101.5	101.5	101.5

Appendix 2

Table B - Step 3, Option 3.a.- Attribute Data Chart

Region	Population	Area	No. of Counties	RUs	MRFs	LFs Industrial	LFs Municipal	LFs Demo	HW LQGs	HW TSDs	SW Non-LF Facilities	Non-Metallic Mines	Totals
Statewide Totals	5,143,000	54,314	72	1,072	142	41	45	41	818	26	290	1,930	
SER	1,998,332	3,135	8	151	24	8	6	0	385	14	41	160	
Model # 1	0.0427	0.0063	0.0033	0.0099	0.0085	0.0195	0.0133	0.0000	0.0847	0.0538	0.0113	0.0017	0.2551
Model # 2				0.0141	0.0118	0.0273	0.0187	0.0000	0.1083	0.0700	0.0156	0.0017	0.2674
Model #3	0.0544	0.0052	0.0022	0.0113	0.0068	0.0234	0.0160	0.0000	0.0847	0.0538	0.0071	0.0017	0.2666
SCR	948,500	8,736	12	337	28	8	8	4	109	5	90	380	
Model # 1	0.0203	0.0177	0.0050	0.0220	0.0099	0.0195	0.0178	0.0049	0.0240	0.0192	0.0248	0.0039	0.1890
Model # 2				0.0314	0.0138	0.0273	0.0249	0.0059	0.0306	0.0250	0.0341	0.0039	0.1970
Model # 3	0.0258	0.0145	0.0033	0.0251	0.0079	0.0234	0.0213	0.0039	0.0240	0.0192	0.0155	0.0039	0.1880
NER	992,036	9,905	16	223	18	10	10	2	165	1	43	500	
Model # 1	0.0212	0.0201	0.0067	0.0146	0.0063	0.0244	0.0222	0.0024	0.0363	0.0038	0.0119	0.0052	0.1751
Model # 2				0.0208	0.0089	0.0341	0.0311	0.0029	0.0464	0.0050	0.0163	0.0052	0.1707
Model # 3	0.0270	0.0164	0.0044	0.0166	0.0051	0.0293	0.0267	0.0020	0.0363	0.0038	0.0074	0.0052	0.1802
WCR	837,089	14,361	18	219	44	10	11	18	115	5	75	400	
Model # 1	0.0179	0.0291	0.0075	0.0143	0.0155	0.0244	0.0244	0.0220	0.0253	0.0192	0.0207	0.0041	0.2244
Model # 2				0.0204	0.0217	0.0341	0.0342	0.0263	0.0323	0.0250	0.0284	0.0041	0.2268
Model #3	0.0228	0.0238	0.0050	0.0163	0.0124	0.0293	0.0293	0.0176	0.0253	0.0192	0.0129	0.0041	0.2181
NOR	367,045	17,651	18	142	28	5	10	17	44	1	41	490	
Model # 1	0.0079	0.0357	0.0075	0.0093	0.0099	0.0122	0.0222	0.0207	0.0097	0.0038	0.0113	0.0051	0.1553
Model # 2				0.0132	0.0138	0.0171	0.0311	0.0249	0.0124	0.0050	0.0156	0.0051	0.1381
Model #3	0.0100	0.0292	0.0050	0.0106	0.0079	0.0146	0.0267	0.0166	0.0097	0.0038	0.0071	0.0051	0.1463

Key

Model # 1 - Uses all data groups from chart

Model # 2 -Uses all data groups from chart, except population, area and counties

Model # 3 - Uses all data groups from chart, more emphasis placed on population than Model # 1

Appendix 3

Table C - Step 3, Option 3.a. – Percentage of Totals for Attributes												
Region	Population	Area	No. of Counties	RUs	MRFs	LFs Industrial	LFs Municipal	LFs Demo	HW LQGs	HW TSDs	SW Non-LF Facilities	Non-Metallic Mines
SER	0.3886	0.0577	0.1111	0.1409	0.1690	0.1951	0.1333	0.0000	0.4707	0.5385	0.1414	0.0829
SCR	0.1844	0.1608	0.1667	0.3144	0.1972	0.1951	0.1778	0.0976	0.1333	0.1923	0.3103	0.1969
NER	0.1929	0.1824	0.2222	0.2080	0.1268	0.2439	0.2222	0.0488	0.2017	0.0385	0.1483	0.2591
WCR	0.1628	0.2644	0.2500	0.2043	0.3099	0.2439	0.2444	0.4390	0.1406	0.1923	0.2586	0.2073
NOR	0.0714	0.3250	0.2500	0.1325	0.1972	0.1220	0.2222	0.4146	0.0538	0.0385	0.1414	0.2539
Totals	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000

Table D - Step 3, Option 3.a. – Weighting Factors Used in Calculations												
Region	Population	Area	No. of Counties	RUs	MRFs	LFs Industrial	LFs Municipal	LFs Demo	HW LQGs	HW TSDs	SW Non-LF Facilities	Non-Metallic Mines
Model #1	0.11	0.11	0.03	0.07	0.05	0.1	0.1	0.05	0.18	0.1	0.08	0.02
Model # 2				0.1	0.07	0.14	0.14	0.06	0.23	0.13	0.11	0.02
Model # 3	0.14	0.09	0.02	0.08	0.04	0.12	0.12	0.04	0.18	0.1	0.05	0.02

Explanation of Weighting Factors: The combination of all weighting factors for a particular model must total to 100%. The workgroup first decided what relative weight to give to the population, land area and number of counties for each model. The workgroup then decided what relative weight to give to the total workload in the four main program areas – Solid Waste, Hazardous Waste, Recycling and Mining. That relative weight was then apportioned to the attributes for that program area according to relative workload. Thus, the final weighting factor for a single attribute as shown in "Table D" is dependent upon the relative workload of the overall program area, the number of attributes that were considered for that program area, and the relative workload for that attribute in comparison to other attributes within that program area. Using this method, one cannot compare the weighting factors across programs because the total weight for the solid waste program, for example, is split between 4 attributes whereas the total weight for hazardous waste is split between only 2 attributes.

Example: For Model #1 in Table D, Population and Area were both given a weighting factor of 11% and the number of counties was assigned a 3% weight. Recycling as considered to have 12% of the overall workload, Solid Waste 33%, Hazardous Waste 28% and Nonmetallic Mining 2%. These relative proportions are based generally upon the proportionate staffing guidance contained in the latest Workplanning Guidance. In this model, the 12% workload for Recycling was apportioned between RUs (7%) and MRFs (5%). The 33% for Solid Waste was apportioned between industrial landfills (10%), municipal landfills (10%), demolition landfills (5%) and non-landfill facilities (8%). The 28% for Hazardous Waste is split between LQGs (18%) and TSDs (10%). Non-metallic mining has only one attribute, so the 2% factor is assigned to the number of mines.

Appendix 4

Table E - Step 3 - Regional Allocation Models - % of Regional FTE

	Reorg %	Model #1 %	Model # 2 %	Model # 3 %	Model # 4 %	Model # 5 %	Model # 6 %
SER	28.00%	25.51%	26.74%	26.66%	28.00%	27.70%	26.76%
SCR	19.10%	18.90%	19.70%	18.80%	19.10%	18.90%	19.00%
NER	19.10%	17.51%	17.07%	18.02%	19.10%	18.90%	18.32%
WCR	19.10%	22.44%	22.68%	21.81%	19.10%	18.90%	20.79%
NOR	14.70%	15.53%	13.81%	14.63%	14.70%	15.70%	15.12%

Table F - Step 3 - Regional FTE Target Options

	Reorg FTE	Current FTE	Model # 1 FTE	Model # 2 FTE	Model # 3 FTE	Model # 4 FTE	Model # 5 FTE	Model # 6 FTE
SER	22.0	17.0	*17.7*	18.6	*18.5*	19.4	19.5	18.5
SCR	15.0	12.0	*13.1*	13.7	*13.1*	13.3	13.3	13.2
NER	15.0	13.0	*12.2*	11.9	*12.5*	13.3	13.3	12.8
WCR	15.0	14.0	*15.6*	15.8	*15.1*	13.3	13.3	14.4
NOR	12.5	11.0	*11.8*	10.6	*11.2*	11.2	11.1	11.5
Totals	79.5	67.0	*70.4*	70.5	*70.4*	70.5	70.4	70.4

Key

Model # 1 - Uses all data groups from chart
Model # 2 - Uses all data groups from chart, except population, area and counties
Model # 3 - Uses all data groups from chart, with more emphasis placed on population than Model # 1
Model # 4 - Uses the proportional split from re-org, less metallic mining
Model # 5 - Uses the proportional split from re-org, but does not subtract metallic mining at Step No. 2
Model # 6 - Is an average between Model # 1 and Model # 4

Note: Models 1-4 subtract metallic mining at Step No. 2, and Model No. 5 does not.

Appendix 5 – Alternative Analysis for NOR Mining FTE Comment

On September 22, 2000, The Northern Region submitted a comment regarding the calculations made under Alternative I of Option 2.b. (Step 2 of the process). The results for Alternative I of option 2.b. are subsequently carried over to Alternative II.a., II.b. and II.c. of Option 2.b. in Step 2 and to Step 3. In the calculations that NOR commented upon, the metallic mining positions in the program were subtracted out for purposes of considering changes since Reorganization. The mining positions were then subsequently added back in to determine the final target numbers. NOR commented that two mining positions were subtracted from the reorganization FTE numbers in the workgroup's calculations, but in their opinion, only one FTE should have been subtracted.

According to the NOR comment, Ken Markart was the only mining position on the reorganization charts. The position formerly occupied by Archie Wilson was originally on the charts as the NOR Hydro position. There was a subsequent decision to use the NOR hydrogeologist position as a NOR regional mining team leader and devote 2.0 FTE to metallic mining. The workgroup used 2 FTE as the level of metallic mining work in the calculations whereas NOR contends that only 1.0 FTE should have been considered. Arguments could be made on both sides. If the NOR comment were utilized, the calculations would change as follows:

Step 2: This step is used to determine the bureau / regional split for the total number of available FTE.

Alternative I for Option 2.b. Make the following adjustments:

At the 2nd step, instead of subtracting 6 FTE for mining, subtract 5 FTE for mining from 115.75 leaving **110.75** in the program w/o mining.
Of those, 32.25/110.75 = **29.1%** were in the bureau and 78.5/110.75 = **70.9**% were in the regions. Apply those percentages to the next step.

At the 3rd step , multiply the present 96.5 FTE by the adjusted percentages above to arrive at the following:

96.5 FTE x 29.1% = **28.08 FTE** in the bureau w/o mining positions
96.5 FTE x 70.9% = **68.42 FTE** in the regions w/o mining positions

At the 4th step, add the mining positions back in..

The **revised regional total target** is **69.42 FTE**. This equals the 68.42 FTE from above plus 1.0 FTE NOR mining = 69.42 FTE total for regions. Proceed to step 3 in Section VII of this report. Apply an agreed upon model (see alternative models for regional workload) to the 68.42 FTE in the regions (from the revised 3rd step above) to determine the split between regions. Then when the split between regions is done, determine the total regional target by adding the 1.0 FTE back in NOR for metallic mining for a total of 69.42 FTE in the regions (68.42 from #3 above plus 1.0 = 69.42).

The **revised bureau total target is 32.08 FTE** w/o the mining project position. This consists of the 28.08 FTE from above plus the 4.0 FTE for metallic mining. 28.08 + 4.0 = 32.08 FTE.

Alternative II.a. for Option 2.b. Under this option, the recycling positions are considered to be subtracted out in proportion to the bureau/regional split from Alternative I. Therefore, under this

option as explained in the main body of the report, the bureau /regional split is identical to Alternative I of option 2.b. The **revised targets**, therefore, would be **32.08 FTE bureau** and **69.42 FTE regional** total with mining positions under this alternative.

Alternative II.b. for Option 2.b. This alternative subtracts all of the 3.75 FTE RCY cuts from the bureau. The revised numbers would be:

100.25 x **29.1%** = 29.17 FTE bureau w/o mining and w/o 3.75 FTE recycling cut.
100.25 x **70.9%** = 71.08 FTE regions w/o mining and w/o 3.75 FTE recycling cut.
29.17 – 3.75 RCY + 4.0 mining = **29.42 bureau revised target**
71.08 – 0.0 RCY + 1.0 mining = **72.08 region revised target**

Alternative II.c. for Option 2.b. Make the following adjustments:

This is the recommended "split the difference" alternative averaging between alternatives II.a. and II.b.
The **revised bureau target** would be **30.75 FTE** (32.08 + 29.42) / 2 = 30.75 FTE. This compares to the recommendation in the main body of the report for 31.0 FTE (rounded from 31.05) as the bureau target.
The **revised regional target** would be **70.75 FTE** (69.42 + 72.08) / 2 = 70.75 FTE. This compares to the recommendation in the main body of the report for 70.5 FTE (rounded from 70.45) as the regional target.

Step 3: This is the step to determine the split among the regions for the target FTE available to the regions. From step 2, at total of 70.75 FTE under this revision would be available to the regions rather than 70.45 FTE as recommended in the main body of the report. This is an increase of 0.3 in the regional total to be divided according to the various models among the 5 regions. The workgroup did not carry this 0.3 FTE increase into each of the six models used in step 3, but it appears that in no case using any of the models would a revision result in any region for the target number of FTE to increase by more than 0.1 FTE. Therefore, the workgroup did not revise it's recommendation.

IX. Decision Summary

DECISION SUMMARY
Waste Management Program

Summary of FTE Workgroup Recommendations and
Waste Management Team Decisions Made on October 11, 2000

I. Recommendations and Decisions Related to FTE Target Numbers

A. Total Number of FTE in the Program

Workgroup Recommendation: It is recommended that the baseline number of permanent FTE available should be 101.5 permanent FTE.
WaMT Decision: The WaMT approved this recommendation.

B. Regions / Central Office Split

Workgroup Recommendation: It is recommended that the 101.5 FTE be split as 70.5 permanent FTE target for the regions and 31.0 permanent FTE target for the bureau. This recommendation follows alternative II.c. under option 2.b. for step 2). The current split of filled positions is:

	Current Filled	Recommended Target
Bureau	33.5 FTE*	31.0 FTE
Regions	67.0 FTE	70.5 FTE

* includes the 2.0 FTE perm. currently being recruited.

WaMT Decision: The WaMT approved this recommendation.

C. Allocation of Regional FTE Between Regions:

Workgroup Recommendation: It is recommended that the regional "target" FTE be as follows in accordance with Model #6 which is the average of Model #1 and Model #4. In addition, it is recommended that the final target numbers be rounded to the nearest 0.5 FTE as shown:

	Calculated Target	Final Rounded Target	Current*
SER	18.5 FTE	18.5 FTE	17.0 FTE
SCR	13.2 FTE	13.0 FTE	12.0 FTE
NER	12.8 FTE	13.0 FTE	13.0 FTE
WCR	14.4 FTE	14.5 FTE	14.0 FTE
NOR	11.5 FTE	11.5 FTE	11.0 FTE
Total	70.45 FTE	70.5 FTE	67.0 FTE

* "Current" as of 8/00. This number does not account for the two new regional vacancies discussed in item II.C. below.

WaMT Decision: The WaMT made a decision by means of a majority vote, but did not achieve consensus. The WaMT vote was 10 in favor of the recommendation, 3 opposed (NOR and NER supervisors) and 3 abstentions. The NER supervisors indicated that they were opposed but would "have to live with" the group decision. The NOR supervisor indicated that NOR "could not live with" this decision because NOR needed the ability to fill up to 12.0 FTE (one above their currently filled FTE) when positions were available. The bureau director indicated that the decision of the WaMT would be forwarded with a minority report.

(Note: The NOR Regional Team Supervisor subsequently communicated the following by telephone: The minority report should restate the position stated at the meeting that NOR needs a FTE target of at least 12.0 FTE based upon workload and our need to be able to make a future case for an additional position over the 11.0 FTE current staff when a future "over target" vacancy becomes available within the overall WA program. GL.)

II. Recommendations and Decisions Related to Implementation and Appeals

A. Timing:

Workgroup Recommendation: The process should become applicable immediately upon agreement of the Waste Management Team. Agreement requires adoption of target numbers as well as reaching decisions on the other issues described in this section. Once this new process is applicable, new vacancies within a work unit can be refilled without going back to the WMT as long as the work unit is within its target number. This will allow most vacancies to be filled in a much more timely manner. The vacancies discussed in C) below wouldn't be included in the new process.

WaMT Decision: The WaMT approved this recommendation.

B. Filling of Previously Authorized Bureau Positions:

Workgroup Recommendation: A decision was made at the July, 2000 WaMT meeting to allow the bureau to fill three positions. The workgroup recommends that the top two positions (Recycling Team Leader and Hellenbrand/Gold combined position) continue through the filling process that has already started. The third position (Hellenbrand/Johnson) that was authorized for filling, as well as the fourth position (Ivanov) identified as next in line should be reevaluated under the new process.

WaMT Decision: The WaMT decided that filling of the top two previously authorized positions will continue but that the third or any potential additional positions will be considered as part of the new process. A decision was not made at the October 11 meeting on when to fill this third vacancy or where to assign it. Since the October 11 meeting, the Bureau of Finance has indicted that the target number of positions may have to be reduced to 100.5 FTE due to additional funding problems. Therefore, at a future WaMT meeting, the WaMT will have to decide: a) whether the total target number has to be reduced and if so, which organizational unit's target number will be reduced; or b) if the target number does not have to be reduced, where to fill the vacancy by either a bureau "appeal" or assigning the vacancy to a region in accordance with the new process.

C. New Vacancies: Two new vacancies have occurred between the July meeting and the October WaMT meeting (Mark Stephenson – WCR and Mary Rothenmaier – SCR).

Workgroup Recommendation: The workgroup recommends that a decision be made at the October, 2000 WaMT meeting on how those positions (as well as any additional vacancies that may occur before the effective date of the new process) should be dealt with. Alternatives include:

consideration of these two new vacancies in a pool with all vacancies within the program. The WaMT would then make a decision similar to that made at the July, 2000 WaMT meeting to select the two highest priority vacancies within the overall statewide program and authorizing those positions to be filled.

authorizing the two regions with the new vacancies to proceed to fill immediately since both regions are below their proposed FTE "target number."

WaMT Decision: The WaMT decided on alternative a) and agreed to vote. Agreed upon criteria to consider were 1) most vacant positions under target, 2) longest duration of vacancy, 3) vacancy rate within vacant classification, 4) critical program need according to program priorities and statewide deficit in classification, and 5) program funding concerns. Based upon a tally of written ballots, it was decided that WCR and SCR would be able to fill current vacancies.

D. Work Units Over Currently Target Numbers:

Workgroup Recommendation: The intent of the target numbers is to deal with new vacancies as they occur. Positions in work units that are over their target level (i.e., the bureau) will not be transferred until a new vacancy occurs in that unit. There will also be no formal transfer of work responsibilities (i.e. an existing staff in an over target work unit remaining in the same location but doing work for a unit that is under target) between work units if there is no vacancy to transfer. Informal arrangements between work unit supervisors may still be pursued as is currently done in the plan review area.
WaMT Decision: The WaMT approved the workgroup recommendation

E. Rotating Sector Specialist Obligation:

Workgroup Recommendation: The bureau director proposes that the bureau assume 1/2 FTE sector specialist, and that one of the regions reassign a staff person to make another 1/2 FTE sector specialist. This will need to be a permanent assignment under the bureau director's proposal and could affect the "target numbers" that are finally agreed to.
WaMT Decision: The WaMT agreed that the bureau should assign 0.5 FTE permanently from the bureau for this purpose, but could not agree on how to meet the other 0.5 FTE obligation. This needs to be determined by the end of the year. The bureau director will propose a process for determining how the remainder of this obligation will be met.

F. Appeals Process:

Workgroup Recommendation: An appeal may be made for either of two types of FTE adjustments to the "target numbers" – either an "interim" adjustment or a "permanent" adjustment. The descriptions of these two types and the procedures for appeals were described in the detailed report.
WaMT Decision: The WaMT approved the recommended appeals process with the bureau director's dissent. The bureau director's objection related to 1) no specified time frame for appeals, 2) possible need for boundaries/criteria for appeal and 3) the proposed procedure involving voting. The workgroup was authorized to make decisions on the first two of these issues and to report their decision to the WaMT at the November conference call.

(NOTE: On November 3, 2000, the Workgroup subsequently decided on the following time frames:

TIMEFRAME/BOUNDARIES FOR FILING AN APPEAL FOR FTE ADJUSTMENT

- *An appeal must be filed by the manager who has the "over-target" vacancy within two weeks after the vacancy occurs.*
- *The appeal will be sent by e-mail to the WaMT.*
- *The manager filing the appeal has the option of scheduling a conference call with the WaMT to discuss the appeal. The conference call must be held before the final vote is due.*
- *Votes on the appeal are due within two weeks after the appeal is filed.)*

(Note: On November6, 2000 the bureau director submitted the following additional perspective as a minority report: Voting is not a good way to make decisions for the program. Even with a 2/3 vote deciding, it is a popularity contest with the person who can be the best spokesperson (or the most tenacious tiring everyone else out) coming out ahead. Either go with consensus or designate a decision-maker and a type of decision per one of the decision-making models offered by Barb Hummel. – S.B.)

G. Future Reductions:

The WA program may already have to face a reduction in the total statewide FTE target number by 1.0 FTE (see "WaMT Decision" under item "II.B." above). In addition future position cuts in the program could be necessary due to budgetary or legislative issues. It is possible that a position cut could be directed toward a particular function in a particular location, or it could be a general budgetary cut across the program. When a position is lost so that the program can no longer sustain a target level of 101.5 FTE, the WA program will have to have a process for identifying the lost position and subtracting it from the target level of the particular organizational unit. If the "target numbers" are not

maintained and current to reflect the actual number of positions that the program can sustain, then the new system will fail and vacancies will have to be held.

Workgroup Recommendation: The workgroup acknowledged that the target numbers must be maintained to reflect the current level of funding, but it was not within the workgroup's charge to develop a process for subtracting positions from the agreed upon "target" of 101.5 FTE.

WaMT Decision: The WaMT will have to decide upon where to subtract positions from the target numbers if funding or positions or are lost. The criteria will have to be case-by-case depending upon the circumstances of the lost position(s). At a WaMT meeting in the near future, the WaMT will have to decide whether there is a generic process or sideboards that should be applied to these decisions.